

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ALBANY DIVISION**

DON ROBERT FAIRCLOTH, :  
: Plaintiff, :  
: :  
v. : Case No.: 1:11-cv-113 (WLS)  
: :  
CHRISTINE CROSS, :  
: Defendant. :  
: :  
-----

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Don Robert Faircloth's motion styled as "Plaintiff's Response to Court's Order and Notice of Appeal." (Doc. 142.) In his motion, Faircloth claims the Court erred in denying his Motion for Relief from Judgment because this Court and Attorney General Samuel Olens are vexatious, have disregard for his health and safety, and made errors of law. Additionally, Faircloth submits to the Court a series of questions and "asks the Court to answer and submit a response to his stated questions."

The Court construes Faircloth's motion as a motion for reconsideration, as it attacks the legal basis underlying the Court's most recent substantive Order, a denial of his Motion for Relief from Judgment. Courts in this district grant motions for reconsideration in three circumstances: (1) when the movant demonstrates that there has been an intervening change in the law; (2) new evidence has been discovered that was not previously available to the parties through the exercise of due diligence; or (3) the Court has made a clear error of law. *McCoy v. Macon Water Auth.*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222–23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

Because Faircloth has not identified a change in the law or newly discovered evidence, the only plausible basis for his motion is that the Court made a clear error of law. But even that ground is without merit. Faircloth provided no compelling basis to grant him relief from judgment. To the contrary, he repeated the same arguments he's made since he first filed his complaint. Faircloth's promise to continue pursuing his case even before the Court dismissed his claims is compelling evidence no extraordinary circumstances exist warranting a relief from the judgment.

Faircloth's motion (Doc. 142) is **DENIED**. Faircloth is not entitled to a list of answers to his various questions. The bases for the Court's rulings have been set out in detail in its orders.

**SO ORDERED**, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June 2013.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

**THE HONORABLE W. LOUIS SANDS,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**